



## **(Lack) of semantic equivalence between variants**

Christensen, Tanya Karoli; Jensen, Torben Juel

*Publication date:*  
2014

*Document version*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Christensen, T. K., & Jensen, T. J. (2014). *(Lack) of semantic equivalence between variants*. Abstract from Sociosyntax, København, Denmark.

## (Lack) of semantic equivalence between variants

Tanya Karoli Christensen & Torben Juel Jensen  
LANCHART, University of Copenhagen

It is a long-standing dispute in variationist sociolinguistics whether and in what sense the linguistic variants under study need to be semantically equivalent to collectively form a variable (Sankoff 1973, see, e.g., Romaine 1984, Dines 1980, Lavandera 1978, Terkourafi 2011, Pichler 2010, Hasan 2009[1989]). Labov's famous tenet states that sociolinguists should study "variable ways of saying *the same thing*" (Labov 1972; our italics). But especially when studying variables 'above and beyond phonology' (Sankoff 1973), some sort of meaning difference will generally play a part in determining the distribution of each variant.

Several authors have suggested alternative bases for defining a methodologically valid variable other than (the inherently excluded) semantic equivalence. A range of equivalence types have been proposed from *truth-conditional* (Weiner and Labov 1983) over *pragmatic* or *illocutionary* (e.g. Dines 1980, Romaine 1984, Terkourafi 2011) to *structural* equivalence (Pichler 2010, giving epistemic phrases such as "I don't know", "I don't think" as an example).

At the other end of the process of linguistic investigation awaits a related question. Once variants have been coded and distributions determined, we need to assess the implications of our findings in regard to grammatical status. Categorical distributions are easily interpreted as instances of rules-without-exceptions. But hardly any distributions are in fact categorical, so the question becomes one of cut-off points: How large a proportion must (the least used) variant comprise for it to count as variation? Must this variation be related to external factors for it to be sociolinguistically relevant (in other words: is it by definition a categorical distinction if it is only/mainly linguistically determined)?

In our paper we will discuss these questions in relation to two ongoing studies of grammatical variation and change exploiting the LANCHART corpus of spoken Danish (Gregersen 2009, Gregersen, Maegaard, and Phrao 2014): 1. word order, and 2. general extenders.

### 1. Word order

Danish (as well the other mainland Scandinavian languages) distinguishes between two word orders: 'Main clause word order' places sentence adverbials and negations after the finite verb (V>Adv), while the 'subordinate clause word order' always has sentence adverbials placed before the finite verb (Adv>V). In spite of terminology, both word orders are found in subclauses:

(1) (det er også en af grundene til) at vi tør **næsten ikke** at flytte (V>Adv)  
(that is also one of the reasons to) that we dare almost not to move

(1') at vi **næsten ikke** tør at flytte (Adv>V)  
that we almost not dare to move

'that's also one of the reasons that we almost don't dare to move'

V>Adv word order in subclauses is a type of Main Clause Phenomenon (Aelbrecht, Haegeman, and Nye 2012), and as such it has been argued to signal relative informational importance, dubbed

*emphasis, assertion, main point of utterance or foreground* (Hooper and Thompson 1973, Meinunger 2006, Julien 2007, Simons 2007, Wiklund et al. 2009, Jensen and Christensen 2013).

In our study, almost 9,000 subclauses have been manually coded for a range of factors relevant to hypotheses regarding foregrounding, ranging from type of matrix predicate to presence of conjunction, enabling multifactorial analyses of the relative effects on the distribution of the two word orders (Jensen and Christensen 2013). The results support the hypothesis that V>Adv word order is associated with foregrounding, but notably, only if we accept it as a statistical tendency in language use rather than as an invariant coding. This raises the question of the status of grammatical categories, also addressed in usage-based models such as exemplar theory (Pierrehumbert 2001, Bybee 2006). In contrast to earlier suggestions, our results only show a small influence on word order of non-linguistic variables such as geography, time and social class.

## 2. General extenders

Another variable to be discussed in our paper is general extenders (GEs), such as Eng. *and stuff like that, or something*. Previous studies have found that it is a feature of youth speech, sometimes correlated with sex and class (e.g. Dubois 1992, Cheshire 2007, Tagliamonte and Denis 2010, Pichler and Levey 2011), but also that GEs have a variety of different functions in discourse (Dines 1980, Overstreet 1999, Cheshire 2007).

In our study, all GEs occurring in the data are coded for a number of linguistic and contextual variables based on findings of previous studies, e.g. category and number of other referents in the extended phrase, presence of right-peripheral discourse markers, position of the GE in the utterance, and co-speakers' treatment of the utterance with respect to conversational turn taking. This coding allows us to follow grammaticalization processes of the different GE types based on distributional and mixed models analyses. Regarding social factors, our data support the general finding that GEs are more frequent in youth speech. Adolescents have the highest relative frequency of GEs, and speakers tend to decrease their GE use during their life span, whilst participating in community changes regarding the use of the different GE types.

Clearly, both of these variables (word order and general extenders) involve semantic and functional differences between variants. On the other hand, they also share functional/semantic characteristics, albeit at another level: Both the V>Adv and the Adv>V word orders are used to form Danish clauses (main or subordinate), and in subclauses both *may* express foreground information, but only one *signals* it (V>Adv). All general extenders may refer to open-ended or vague lists and may thus perform acts of positive politeness in suggesting in-group membership with the hearer ('you understand what I mean because we share experience/outlook on life/taste...').

So how do we interpret our findings? Are we dealing with a sociolinguistic variable at all in the case of the word order distinction (previous studies find regional differences, but we only find them marginally; on the other hand, there is to all appearances a large difference between spoken and written Danish with respect to word order)? What does it mean when we find that the GE type with *sådan noget* (lit. 'such some') was predominantly a WC male feature in the 80s, and decreases in use over time, but is still by far the most prevalent, especially in youth speech? And what are the implications of our finding that predictions based on apparent time use of GE types do not hold up in real time?

## References:

- Aelbrecht, Lobke, Liliane Haegeman, and Rachel Nye. 2012. *Main Clause Phenomena*. Edited by Werner Abraham and Elly van Gelderen, *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bybee, Joan. 2006. "From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition." *Language* no. 82 (4):711-733.
- Cheshire, Jenny. 2007. "Discourse variation, grammaticalisation and stuff like that." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* no. 11 (2):155-193.
- Dines, Elizabeth R. 1980. "Variation in Discourse: "And Stuff like That". " *Language in Society* no. 9 (1):13-31.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 1992. "Extension particles, etc." *Language Variation and Change* no. 4 (2):179-203.
- Gregersen, Frans. 2009. "The data and design of the LANCHART study." *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* no. 41:3-29.
- Gregersen, Frans, Marie Maegaard, and Nicolai Pharao. 2014. "The LANCHART Corpus." In *The Oxford Handbook on Corpus Phonology*, edited by Jacques Durand, Ulrike Gut and Gjert Kristoffersen, 534-545. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hasan, Ruqaiya. 2009[1989]. "Semantic variation and sociolinguistics." In *The Collected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan*, edited by Jonathan J. Webster. London/Oakville: Equinox.
- Hooper, Joan B., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. "On the applicability of root transformations." *Linguistic Inquiry* no. 4 (4):465-497.
- Jensen, Torben Juel, and Tanya Karoli Christensen. 2013. "Promoting the demoted: The distribution and semantics of "main clause word order" in spoken Danish complement clauses." *Lingua* no. 137:38-58.
- Julien, Marit. 2007. "Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish." *Working papers in scandinavian syntax* no. 80:103-161.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Lavandera, Beatriz L. 1978. "Where does the sociolinguistic variable stop?" *Language in Society* no. 7 (2):171-182.
- Meinunger, André. 2006. "On the discourse impact of subordinate clauses." In *The architecture of focus*, edited by Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Overstreet, Maryann. 1999. *Whales, Candlelight, and Stuff Like That. General Extenders in English Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pichler, Heike. 2010. "Methods in discourse variation analysis: Reflections on the way forward." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* no. 14 (5):581-608.
- Pichler, Heike, and Stephen Levey. 2011. "In search of grammaticalization in synchronic dialect data: general extenders in northeast England." *English Language and Linguistics* no. 15 (03):441-471.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet B. 2001. "Exemplar dynamics: word frequency, lenition and contrast." In *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, edited by Joan Bybee and Paul Hopper, 137-158. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1984. "On the Problem of Syntactic Variation and Pragmatic Meaning." *Folia Linguistica* no. 18 (3/4):409-437.
- Sankoff, Gillian. 1973. "Above and beyond phonology in variable rules." In *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, edited by Charles-James N. Bailey and Roger W. Shuy, 42-62. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Simons, Mandy. 2007. "Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition." *Lingua* no. 117:1034-1056.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. , and Derek Denis. 2010. "The stuff of change: General extenders in Toronto, Canada." *Journal of English Linguistics* no. 38 (2).
- Terkourafi, Marina. 2011. "The pragmatic variable: Toward a procedural interpretation." *Language in Society* no. 40:343-372.
- Weiner, Judith, and William Labov. 1983. "Constraints on the Agentless Passive." *Journal of Linguistics* no. 19 (1):29-58.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Kristine Bentzen, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2009. "On the distribution and illocution of V2 in Scandinavian that-clauses." *Lingua* (119):1914-1938.